DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 750 HE 029 350

AUTHOR Quinley, John W.
TITLE The Use of Influence Tactics among Mid-Level Managers in the Community College. AIR 1996 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 96
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (36th, Albuquerque, NM, May 5-8, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; College Administration; Community Colleges; Higher Education; *Influences; Institutional Research; *Middle Management; Personnel Management; *Politics of Education; Power Structure
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

A survey investigated the extent to which mid-level managers in community colleges used influence tactics. Survey respondents (N=208) reported on a variety of influence behaviors, categorized into nine influence dimensions (rational, consultation, inspiration, ingratiation, legitimating, exchange, coalition, personal, and pressure). Analysis of responses revealed, that, on the average, rational persuasion, consultation, and inspiration appeals were moderately used; ingratiating appeals and legitimating tactics were used occasionally; and exchange tactics, personal appeals, coalition tactics, and pressure tactics were very seldom used. Except for legitimating tactics, all influence dimensions differed significantly in frequency of use by organization direction defined as directed toward co-workers, subordinates, or superiors. Personal characteristics and college size were not strong correlates of influence tactic use. This community college population used influence more often than a comparison corporate population though the rank order of use by influence tactics was almost identical. Possible confounding aspects such as under-reporting of tactics perceived to be self-serving are addressed. (Contains 8 tables and 34 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

6

ED 397 750

THE USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS AMONG MID-LEVEL MANAGERS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

John W. Quinley, Ed.D.,

Director of Planning & Research

Central Piedmont Community College

PO Box 35009

Charlotte, NC 28235-5009

(704) 342-6592

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE029350

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

AIR
for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-Sixth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, May 5-8, 1996. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Editor
AIR Forum Publications

THE USE OF INFLUENCE TACTICS AMONG MID-LEVEL MANAGERS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This research investigated through a national survey of 208 respondents the extent to which mid-level managers in community colleges used influence tactics. On the average, rational persuasion, consultation, and inspiration appeals were moderately used; ingratiating appeals and legitimating tactics were used occasionally; and exchange tactics, personal appeals, coalition tactics, and pressure tactics were very seldom used. Except legitimating tactics, all influence dimensions differed significantly in frequency of use by organization direction defined as upward, lateral, and downward. The community college population used influence more often than did the corporate population; the rank order of use by influence tactics was almost identical. Three questions for further research were suggested; implications for the practice of institutional research were discussed.

OVERVIEW

The use of power and influence to achieve goals, often in spite of considerable resistance, recurs as a major theme in the history of civilization. This fact has been true for the individual, family, organization, institution, and state. Power may be society's most pervasive social phenomenon (Grimes, 1978), and it is central to understanding social behavior in organizations (Kipnis, 1976). However, the power phenomenon in organizational life is not well understood, nor is the influence process systematically applied in practice. In part, this is a result of the commonly held misconception of power as something that allows leaders to go beyond the need for assistance. On the contrary, organizational leadership is more accurately characterized by mutual dependencies, not isolated independence (Kotter, 1979). This is because gaining cooperation and support in the organization is as critical as power over others. Using power, in all of its manifestations, to influence others in the accomplishment of important organizational objectives is the essence of leadership.

Mid-level managers in the organization often lack the authority and resources to compel others to respond to their need for support (Izraeli, 1975). Sitting in the middle of the organizational structure, mid-level managers must extend their influence toward colleagues, subordinates, and superiors. Void of a strong base of authority, mid-level managers must take special care to use influence tactics in appropriate ways, at appropriate times, and toward appropriate targets.

This study focuses on the power or influence tactics area within the power literature as it is manifested by mid-level managers. Studies here examined the relationship between the tactic used and the level within the organizational structure where the influence attempt was directed. The variation of use for different tactics as the influence attempt was directed toward colleagues, subordinates, or superiors was investigated. However, research results in the tactics area were difficult to generalize across studies because inconsistency of definition and variations in methods limit comparisons. Also, with few exceptions, power tactic studies were conducted in a corporate setting. Typically, the research population consisted of graduate business students who were also managers in the field. Other types of organizations--for example, educational institutions--received little attention. Theoretical work by Etzioni (1975) and Mintzberg (1983) support the contention that the frequency of use for various influence tactics would be different in an educational setting.

RELEVANT LITERATURE

The research literature concerning power in organizations follows three major areas of inquiry -- power sources, power use, and power effect. Research studies examine variables within these individual areas and the relationship among areas. This study focuses on the power use area. In recent years the power use or tactics area has received increased interest

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in the research literature. This research takes a first step toward the eventual merging of the power and the behavioral approaches to leadership, a step that is long overdue (Yukl, 1989). Studies in this area provided insight into the various aspects of influence behavior. Several studies investigated the relationship between the tactic used and where structurally in the organization the influence was directed. However, the findings of these studies were difficult to generalize because the definition of terms used in the research were inconsistent and the research designs employed were often not comparable.

The rationale for this dissertation stems from four studies that examined influence tactics and direction, and that addressed the comparability issue (Falbo, 1977; Kipnis, Schmidt, & Wilkinson, 1980; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). These studies included the development of two instruments that measured influence behavior and intent. The use of these instruments by other researchers has improved the comparison of results across studies and helped focus later research projects.

Falbo (1977) noted that power strategy models were often deduced from theory. While this deductive approach is a legitimate means of studying power, it restricts the types of power behaviors considered. Falbo developed power dimensions inductively. He started by instructing students to write essays explaining how they got their way. The analysis of this content resulted in a listing of separate influence tactics that were then placed into sixteen predetermined dimensions by a group of eight experts. Falbo did not develop a scale instrument based on these dimensions.

Two years later, Kipnis et al. (1980) noted that, of the few power taxonomies available, most were developed from anecdotal evidence or theoretical models. The existing scales varied in the number of influence dimensions and these overlapped both within and across studies. Before Kipnis et al. (1980), the power scales were not subjected to rigorous statistical testing. Kipnis et al. (1980) further noted that qualitative descriptive studies of behavior tactics often uncovered behaviors that were not part of any scale.

The Kipnis et al. (1980) landmark study addressed the issue of scale development and included qualitative and quantitative approaches. The qualitative procedure had part-time graduate students in business writing essays about a successful influence attempt at work. The content of these essays provided 370 power tactics that sorted into 14 dimensions and 58 items. Using the same procedure, five influence objectives were identified. The dimensions and items formed the basis for the development of a Likert-type survey instrument. The survey was sent to a similar population of graduate students. Based on the results of a factor analysis procedure, the initial 14 dimensions were reduced to eight, and the original five reasons for influence remained unchanged.

The study also investigated the effect of influence direction on the selection of influence behavior. Direction was defined as upward or downward in the organization's reporting structure or laterally outside the structure. Kipnis et al. (1980)

proposed that influence tactics varied as a function of organizational direction. He noted that this instrument could serve further research and provide comparable results more readily.

Several researchers followed Kipnis et al.'s (1980) suggestion. Since the 1980 study, the original Kipnis et al. (1980) instrument or a modified version of six dimensions and 27 items (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988) were used by several authors (Ansari & Kapoor, 1978; Erez & Rim, 1981; Erez, Rim, & Keider, 1986; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Kipnis, Schmidt, Swaffin-Smith, & Wilkinson, 1984; Rim & Erez, 1980; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984).

Ten years later, Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) and Yukl and Falbe (1990) reflected on the Kipnis et al. (1980) scales and their aftermath. Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) noted that the original Kipnis et al. (1980) work was not validated. All multivariate techniques such as factor analysis are subject to sample bias and need multiple samples and approaches for verification (Nunnally, 1978). Kipnis et al. (1980) did not replicate results using a second sample or different methods. Therefore, the Kipnis et al. (1980) factor structure may not replicate, and the scales may contain some items that do not have strong content validity.

Schriesheim and Hinkin's (1990) research consisted of several studies to validate the Kipnis et al. (1980) work and improve the scale. Although the results supported the Kipnis et al. (1980) dimensions, the findings did show that improvements could be made by dropping some items. Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) remarked that it would be particularly useful for future research to replicate the current investigation, including the original step of the Kipnis et al. (1980) work that involved the inductive development of power tactic items.

In the same year as the Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990) study, Yukl and Falbe (1990) developed an instrument based in part on Kipnis et al. (1980). The instrument reconceptualized six of the Kipnis et al. (1980) dimensions and added categories for inspiration appeals and consultation. The additions were based on a review of the current thinking about leadership that included transformational leadership as an emerging style (Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989). The Yukl and Falbe (1990) scale included pressure tactics, upward appeals, exchange tactics, coalition tactics, ingratiating tactics, rational persuasion, inspiration appeals, and consultation tactics.

The Yukl and Falbe (1990) study replicated the Kipnis et al. (1980) work using somewhat similar sample and methodology strategy. The Yukl and Falbe (1990) study also developed hypotheses testing the effect of direction on the frequency of influence tactic use. Yukl and Falbe (1990) proposed five hypotheses concerning direction and influence tactic frequency. These were based on the authors' judgment of replicability across several studies (Izraeli, 1975; Kaplan, 1984; Kanter, 1981; Kotter, 1985; Pfeffer, 1981; Sayles, 1989; Strauss, 1962; Stevenson, Pearce, & Porter, 1985). Most, but not all, of the hypotheses were confirmed.

This research is a logical extension of studies conducted by Falbo (1977), Kipnis et al. (1980), Schriesheim and Hinkin (1990), and Yukl and Falbe (1990). Three themes developed by those authors are important to this study; they include: (1) an investigation of the extent influence tactics were used by mid-level managers; (2) the exploration of the relationship between direction and choice of tactic; (3) the validation of an instrument to measure the dimensions of influence intents and tactics.

There is a growing body of research on the choice of influence tactic and the organizational level it is directed toward (Ansari & Kapoor, 1978; Erez & Rim, 1981; Erez, Rim, & Keider, 1986; Kipnis et al., 1980; Kipnis et al., 1984; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Porter et al., 1981; Rim & Erez, 1980; Schilit & Locke, 1982; Schmidt & Kipnis, 1984; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). The use of a standard, or at least similar, instrument to measure type and frequency of influence tactics has aided the interpretation of results across studies. The field needs additional work to further establish these relationships.

Further, in the four key studies, the authors discuss methodological reasons that compel further validation of the Kipnis et al. (1980) and Yukl and Falbe (1990) scales. In general, the authors note the importance of replicating studies that are based on multivariate techniques, and they suggest using somewhat different methods and sampling techniques. However, replicative studies have been few and no study has been conducted for samples outside the corporate organization.

Another key issue that compels further research was not mentioned by those authors. With only a few exceptions (Gillett-Karam, 1988; Roueche et al., 1989), power studies were conducted in a corporate setting. Typically, the research population consisted of graduate business students who were also managers in the field. Other types of organizations--for example, educational institutions--received little attention.

It is reasonable to ask whether the frequency of use for various tactics may be different in an educational setting. Theoretical work by Etzioni (1975) and Mintzberg (1983) support this contention. They argued that power profiles would differ across different types of organizations. Etzioni assigns the corporation to a compliance power pattern he named utilitarian (remunerative). The normative power pattern was of secondary importance. Colleges and universities were placed in the normative power pattern. Mintzberg defines educational institutions as professional bureaucracies. This model has different power dynamics than the several patterns found in corporate organizations.

PURPOSES AND DEFINITIONS

It is now time to extend the study of power tactics into the community college population. This study investigates the extent to which mid-level managers in the community college use various influence tactics, examines the effect of direction within the organizational structure on influence behavior, and compares results with findings in the corporate setting. Also investigated are the relationships between the influence tactic used and demographic characteristics of the respondents, and the influence tactic used and the size of the organization. In this work the variables, "direction," "size," and "demographic characteristic" are independent; the variable, "influence tactic," is dependent.

Influence is defined as one person's attempt (agent) to change the behavior of another (target). Researchers and theorists have proposed various models to classify individual behaviors into classes of influence (Falbo, 1977; Kipnis et al., 1980; Schriesheim & Hinkin, 1990; Yukl & Falbe, 1990). This study adopts the classification system of nine influence tactics developed by Yukl and Falbe (1990) and later revised by Yukl and Manus Associates (1991). Following are definitions of these categories, including a survey item example for each influence tactic.

Pressure tactics - The agent uses demands, threats, or intimidation to convince another to comply with a request or to support a proposal.
Item example - Demand that the person carry out a requested action promptly.

Personal appeals - The agent seeks to persuade others through an appeal to a relationship as a personal favor.
Item example - Appeal to the person's friendship when asking him/her to do something for you.

Exchange tactics - The agent makes an explicit or implicit promise to provide rewards or tangible benefits if others comply with a request or support a proposal, or reminds others of a prior favor to be reciprocated.
Item example - Say that you will make it worth the person's effort if he/she does what you ask.

Coalition tactics - The agent seeks the aid of others to persuade individuals to do something or uses the support of some as an argument for others to agree also.
Item example - Ask other people to provide the person evidence supporting a plan or proposal that you want him/her to support.

Ingratiating appeals - The agent seeks to get others in a good mood or to think favorably of him or her before asking that something be done.
Item example - Compliment the person on past accomplishments before asking him/her to do another task.

Rational persuasion - The agent uses logical arguments and factual evidence to persuade others that a proposal or request is viable and likely to result in the attainment of task objectives.
Item example - Use facts and logic to make a persuasive case for a proposed plan of action that you want the person to support or implement.

Inspiration appeals - The agent makes an emotional request or proposal that arouses enthusiasm by appealing to the values and ideals of others, or by increasing others' confidence that they can do it.
Item example - Explain in an enthusiastic manner why a proposed task or project is important and worthy of the person's best efforts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consultation tactics - The agent seeks the participation of others in making a decision or planning how to implement a proposed policy, strategy, or change.
Item example - Ask the person to help plan a task or activity that will require his/her support and assistance.

Legitimating tactics - The agent seeks to persuade others that the request is consistent with organizational policies and procedures, is approved by higher management, or is consistent with institutional tradition.
Item example - Tell the person your request is consistent with organization rules and policies.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Five research questions guided the study. One of these questions included related hypotheses.

1. *To what extent do mid-level managers in the community college use various influence tactics?*

2. *What is the relationship between the influence tactic and direction as influence attempts point to co-workers, subordinates, and superiors?*

In this work, organizational direction, the independent category, is defined with three levels: lateral, downward, and upward. Influence tactic behavior, the dependent category, includes nine classes: legitimating tactics, rational persuasion, inspiration appeals, consultation, exchange tactics, pressure tactics, ingratiation tactics, personal appeals, and coalition tactics. This conceptual framework creates a research design matrix of nine, three by one relationships. A hypothesis was offered for each of these relationships. Five hypotheses concerning the effect of direction on influence behavior were adopted from Yukl and Falbe (1990). These refer to pressure tactics, exchange tactics, coalition tactics, inspiration appeals, and consultation tactics. This author proposed four additional hypotheses concerning personal appeals, ingratiating appeals, rational persuasion, and legitimating tactics. The hypotheses follow.

- *Pressure tactics* are used most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts.
- *Personal appeals* are used more often in lateral influence attempts than in upward or downward influence attempts.
- *Exchange tactics* are used more often in downward and lateral influence attempts than in upward influence attempts.
- *Coalition tactics* are used more often in upward and lateral influence attempts than in downward influence attempts.
- *Ingratiating appeals* are used more often in lateral and downward influence attempts than in upward attempts.
- *Rational persuasion appeals* are used more often in upward and lateral influence attempts than in downward influence attempts.

- *Inspiration appeals* are used more often in downward influence attempts than in lateral or upward influence attempts.
- *Consultation* is used most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward influence attempts.
- *Legitimating tactics* are used more often in lateral influence attempts than in upward or downward influence attempts.

3. *How does the pattern of power behavior for the corporate and the education organization compare?*

4. *What is the relationship between demographic characteristics and influence behavior?*

Investigated were the relationships between the influence tactic used and demographic characteristics of the respondents. Demographic items included the number of years experience as a mid-level manager, age, race, gender, and highest level of education.

5. *What is the relationship between organizational size and the use of influence tactics?*

Investigated were the influence tactic used and the size of the organization. College sized was grouped into three nominal categories.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

A mailed survey was distributed to a sample of mid-level managers in community colleges. Mid-level managers were defined as deans not reporting directly to the CEO, directors of any unit, coordinators of programs or staffs, department heads, and chairpersons of curriculum programs. The number of mid-level managers in community colleges who meet the definition above is not known. Therefore, a deliberate, purposeful sampling approach was used rather than a random design (Kidder, 1981). Three strategies were employed to obtain a reasonable number of responses for analysis. The goal was to reach at least 200 returns, approximately the number of respondents sampled by Yukl and Falbe (1990). Secondary considerations included securing a sample response that was geographically distributed and that comprised a broad range by school size.

Contacting graduate students in community college leadership programs around the nation through their professors comprised the initial collection approach. Twenty-five copies each of a survey were sent to 42 university professors. In their classes, professors distributed the instruments to individuals that met the mid-level manager definition. The group of university professors represented 33 universities in 21 different states and the District of Columbia.

A second approach involved surveying identified graduates of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin. A former professor in the program wrote a cover letter encouraging respondents to reply and to send completed instruments in the provided return envelope. Seventy-two graduates were selected based on their titles as meeting the test of mid-level managers in the 1993 Community College Leadership Program Alumni Directory. The sample consisted of individuals from 16 states and one Canadian province.

Asking directors of institutional research to complete the questionnaire and to enlist four other mid-level managers at their colleges to also respond entailed a third collection strategy. Responses were returned in a provided envelope. The directors were individuals known personally by the authors. The sample included 28 community colleges from 16 different states.

Instrument

The respondents were asked to complete the "Influence Behavior Questionnaire, Self-Report Agent Version" copyrighted by Gary Yukl and Manus Associates, 1991. Since the landmark Yukl and Falbe study in 1990, the reliability and validity of the scale have been established in a series of studies in the corporate population. The scale consists of 50 items that describe influence behaviors; each item references one of the nine influence dimensions. There are five or six items for each influence dimension.

Written instructions tell respondents there are many different ways to influence a person to carry out a request or perform a necessary task. Depending upon the situation, any of the influence behaviors may be appropriate. Respondents were told that the study was designed to reveal how managers attempt to influence people in their organization. Respondents were asked to indicate how often they use each type of influence attempt with a peer, a subordinate, or the boss. The frequency was recorded on a five-point scale ranging from never to very often.

A demographic data page was added to the influence instrument. Items were as follows: name of community college, current or most recent job title at the community college, number of employees supervised, number of years as a mid-level manager, age, race/ethnicity, gender, and highest level of education completed.

RESULTS

Sample Description

Three data gathering approaches yielded 231 total and 208 usable responses from mid-level managers in community colleges throughout the United States and from one Canadian province. About two-thirds of the mid-level managers were from large colleges, and just over one-third were directors. Respondents aged 45 or greater comprised 61 percent of the total; 80 percent of the mid-level managers were Caucasian, and 52 percent were males. Thirty-six percent of the respondents held master's degrees, and 37 percent held doctoral degrees. Just over one-third of the mid-level managers reported six to ten years of professional experience, and just under one-fifth of the respondents had five or fewer years experience.

Research Question One

To what extent do mid-level managers in the community college use various influence tactics? Mid-level managers in the community college did not use influence tactics uniformly. Three tactics were used moderately often, two tactics occasionally, and four tactics very seldom. Moderately used tactics were rational persuasion, consultation, and inspiration appeals. Occasionally used tactics were ingratiating appeals and legitimating tactics; and very seldom used items were exchange tactics, coalition tactics, personal appeals, and pressure tactics.

Table 1. Distribution of Influence Tactic Responses

Row percents	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Rational	2.0	7.7	21.0	36.4	33.4	3.9
Consultation	4.9	9.1	22.6	35.3	28.1	3.7
Inspiration	7.6	12.8	24.1	31.7	23.9	3.5
Ingratiation	19.0	27.6	28.4	18.8	6.2	2.7
Legitimating	23.6	32.5	25.7	12.8	5.3	2.4
Exchange	45.5	25.2	14.3	9.7	5.3	2.0
Coalition	37.4	35.0	19.2	6.9	1.4	2.0
Personal	42.6	34.0	16.3	5.5	1.6	1.9
Pressure	47.4	32.5	13.6	4.0	2.5	1.9

Key: 1. Never use
2. Very seldom use
3. Use occasionally
4. Use moderately often
5. Use very often

Research Question Two

What is the relationship between the influence tactic and direction as influence attempts point to co-workers, subordinates, and superiors? It was hypothesized that the frequency of influence tactics use would vary by the direction in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the organizational structure. Except for legitimating tactics, all influence dimensions differed significantly in frequency of use toward co-workers, subordinates, and superiors. When mid-level managers used influence tactics, their behaviors were mostly directed toward co-workers; the frequency of use was greatest or tied with another direction in seven of nine influence dimensions. Rational persuasion was the only influence tactic used more often in a direction other than laterally. The frequency of use for rational persuasion was greatest toward a superior.

Table 2. Analysis of Variance of Influence Tactics by Direction in the Organization

	Lateral (N=67)	Downward (N=69)	Upward (N=72)	ANOVA F	MANOVA F
Pressure	1.89_a	1.99_a	1.70_b	5.02^{**}	4.32^{**}
Personal	2.19_a	1.86_b	1.65_c	13.51^{***}	14.16^{***}
Exchange	2.42_a	2.05_b	1.68_c	21.33^{***}	21.89^{***}
Coalition	2.05_a	1.82_b	2.12_a	3.86^{*}	3.41^{*}
Ingratiating	2.83_a	2.84_a	2.30_b	13.62^{***}	12.85^{***}
Rational	3.86_b	3.71_b	4.18_a	14.17^{***}	13.86^{***}
Inspiration	2.19_a	1.86_a	1.65_b	8.91^{***}	8.55^{***}
Consultation	3.77_a	3.99_a	3.44_b	11.96^{***}	11.16^{***}
Legitimating	2.48	2.36	2.46	0.43	0.65

Note: Means with different letters differ significantly at the .05 level by the Duncan multiple range test. The largest statistical difference among means is indicated by the subscript "a" followed by "b" for the next largest and "c" for the smallest mean. If one mean is not statistically different from another mean, they carry the same subscript letter.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Hypotheses were confirmed for pressure tactics, personal appeals, exchange tactics, coalition tactics, ingratiating tactics, and consultation. Hypotheses were not confirmed for rational persuasion, inspiration appeals, and legitimating tactics. Findings of influence tactics use by direction within the organizational structure follow.

- *Pressure tactics* were used most often in downward attempts and least often in upward attempts.
- *Personal appeals* were more often employed in lateral influence attempts than they were in downward or upward attempts.
- *Exchange tactics* were used more often in lateral and downward attempts than they were in upward attempts.
- *Coalition tactics* were used more often toward a superior or peer than they were used to influence a subordinate.
- *Ingratiating appeals* were more frequently used toward a peer or subordinate than they were in upward attempts.
- *Rational persuasion* was found more often in upward and lateral influence attempts than downward attempts.
- *Inspiration appeals* were used more often in lateral and downward attempts than for upward attempts.

- *Consultation* was used most often in downward influence attempts and least often in upward attempts.
- *Legitimating tactics* were not significantly different by organizational direction.

Table 3. Comparison of Predicted and Confirmed Hypotheses

Tactics	Predicted			Found			Confirmed
	Lt	Dn	Up	Lt	Dn	Up	
1. Pressure		1	2	1	1	2	Yes
2. Personal	1	2	2	1	2	3	Yes
3. Exchange	1	1	2	1	2	3	Yes
4. Coalition	1	2	1	1	2	1	Yes
5. Ingratiating	1	1	2	1	1	2	Yes
6. Rational	1	2	1	2	2	1	No
7. Inspiration	2	1	2	1	1	2	No
8. Consultation		1	2	1	1	2	Yes
9. Legitimating	1	2	2	1	1	1	No

Key: Lt = Lateral, Dn = Downward, Up = Upward

Note: "1" indicates the larger predicted or actual mean use. Different numbers indicate a significant difference as predicted by this work or as measured by the Duncan multiple range test at $p < .05$ or greater. The same number for more than one direction means that the predicted values or that the findings were not different.

Research Question Three

How does the pattern of power behavior for the corporate and the education organization compare? The pattern of power behavior was similar in both community college and corporate settings. For all but one tactic, community college mid level managers used influence tactics only slightly more often than did the corporate mid-level managers. The rank ordering of influence tactics by frequency of use was almost identical for the community college and the corporate populations.

Table 4. Comparison of Community College and Corporate Use of Influence Tactics

	Current Study		Yukl[1]		Kipnis[2]	
	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean
Rational	1	3.9	2	3.3	1	3.5
Consultation	2	3.7	1	3.4	—	—
Inspiration	3	3.5	3	2.7	—	—
Ingratiating	4	2.7	4	2.5	2	2.6
Coalition	5	2.0	5	2.2	3	2.2
Exchange	5	2.0	7	1.6	4	1.9
Pressure	7	1.9	6	1.9	5	1.8

[1] Yukl & Falbe, 1990 [2] Kipnis et al., 1980

The level in the organizational structure where influence attempts were directed proved to be an important element in the community college and the corporate setting. In the community college, significant differences for all seven influence tactics by organizational direction were found; six of the seven influence tactics were significantly different in at least one of the two corporate studies.

In both settings, when influence tactics were used, they were most frequently directed toward other co-workers, followed by subordinates, and considerably less toward superiors. Tactics most frequently directed toward co-workers or subordinates were consultation tactics, inspiration appeals, and ingratiating tactics. This pattern was followed for exchange tactics and pressure tactics across the three studies with only a small variation. Rational persuasion was the only tactic that was used more frequently toward a superior. The coalition tactic was the only influence dimension where the use for the community college and corporate populations were markedly different.

Table 5. Comparison of Community College and Corporate Use of Influence Tactics by Organizational Direction

	Lateral	Downward	Upward	F Value
Rational				
Current St	3.9_b	3.7_b	4.2_a	14.2^{**}
Yukl[1]	3.2	3.3	3.3	0.5
Kipnis[2]	3.4_b	3.5_b	3.7_a	7.2^{**}
Consultation				
Current St	3.8_a	4.0_a	3.4_b	12.0^{**}
Yukl	3.4_a	3.6_a	3.3_b	3.7^{*}
Kipnis	---	---	---	---
Inspiration				
Current St	2.2_a	1.9_a	1.7_b	8.9^{**}
Yukl	2.8_a	2.9_a	2.5_b	4.2^{*}
Kipnis	---	---	---	---
Ingratiating				
Current St	2.8_a	2.8_a	2.3_b	13.6^{**}
Yukl	2.6_a	2.6_a	2.2_b	6.1^{**}
Kipnis	2.7_a	2.6_a	2.4_b	16.7^{**}
Coalition				
Current St	2.1_a	1.8_b	2.1_a	3.7^{*}
Yukl	2.2	2.2	2.3	0.2
Kipnis	2.2	2.2	2.3	0.1
Exchange				
Current St	2.4_a	2.1_b	1.7_c	21.3^{**}
Yukl	1.7_a	1.6_a	1.4_b	6.5^{**}
Kipnis	2.0_a	2.0_a	1.7_b	13.5^{**}
Pressure				
Current St	1.9_a	2.0_a	1.7_b	5.0^{**}
Yukl	1.9_b	2.2_a	1.5_b	17.4^{**}
Kipnis	1.6_b	2.4_a	1.4_c	243.9^{**}

1. Yukl & Falbe, 1990 2. Kipnis et al., 1980

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ using Duncan multiple range test.

Research Questions Four and Five

What is the relationship between demographic characteristics and influence behavior? What is the relationship between organizational size and the use of influence tactics? Additional purposes of the study were to determine the relationship of selected personal characteristics of the mid-level managers to the frequency of influence tactics use, and to examine the relationship of organizational size to influence tactics use. The findings showed no significant variation across the mean scores of the various influence tactics by age or gender of the respondents. By race, the only significant difference was the greater use of legitimating tactics by minority mid-level managers. There were two significant differences by educational level. The mean use for ingratiation tactics and pressure tactics was larger for respondents with masters or other degrees than it was for mid-level managers with doctorates. The use of inspiration tactics and exchange tactics was greater for mid-level managers with five or fewer years experiences than was the use of those tactics by more experienced respondents. Only inspiration tactics yielded significant differences by college size; mid-level managers from medium-sized and small colleges used inspiration appeals more often than did counterparts at large institutions.

Table 6. Demographic Personal Characteristics of Respondents and Frequency of Use by Influence Tactics

	Age			Race			Gender		
	≤44	≥45	F	Min	Maj	F	Fem	Mal	F
Rational	3.92	3.92	1.07	3.83	3.96	1.05	3.89	3.95	1.01
Consultation	3.80	3.68	1.06	3.57	3.76	1.63	3.77	3.67	1.04
Inspiration	3.66	3.43	1.33	3.40	3.54	1.18	3.62	3.42	1.09
Ingratiation	2.74	2.60	1.24	2.64	2.66	1.22	2.69	2.63	1.29
Legitimating	2.46	2.42	1.24	2.64	2.37	1.80**	2.35	2.53	1.27
Exchange	2.18	1.95	1.06	2.04	2.04	1.12	2.12	1.97	1.28
Coalition	2.16	1.90	1.24	2.05	1.99	1.05	1.97	2.04	1.01
Personal	2.03	1.81	1.01	2.01	1.87	1.16	1.90	1.90	1.22
Pressure	1.96	1.79	1.02	1.93	1.84	1.01	1.86	1.85	1.07

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 7. Characteristics and Frequency of Usage by Influence Tactics

	Education			Experience			
	Mast/ Other	Doct	F	≤5	6-15	16-30	F
Rational	3.89	3.94	1.35	3.96	3.89	3.95	0.32
Consultation	3.77	3.67	1.01	3.86	3.64	3.74	1.96
Inspiration	3.56	3.44	1.11	3.79_a	3.41_b	3.46_b	4.29**
Ingratiation	2.73	2.53	1.51*	2.79	2.60	2.64	1.17
Legitimating	2.47	2.36	1.22	2.38	2.52	2.28	1.46
Exchange	2.11	1.92	1.21	2.29_a	1.95_b	1.98_b	4.12**
Coalition	20.6	1.90	1.46	2.08	1.96	2.04	0.49
Personal	1.92	1.85	1.36	2.07	1.83	1.87	2.52
Pressure	1.94	1.72	1.67**	1.90	1.85	1.83	0.22

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Note. Means with different letters differ significantly by the Duncan multiple range test.

Table 8. Size of Institution and Frequency of Usage by Influence Tactics

	Small	Med.	Large	F Value
	<2,999	5,999	3,000-6,000>	
Rational	3.86	4.01	3.92	0.62
Consultation	3.77	3.77	3.70	0.24
Inspiration	3.58_a	3.77_a	3.44_b	2.38*
Ingratiation	2.75	2.71	2.61	0.75
Legitimating	2.41	2.52	2.43	0.17
Exchange	2.12	2.26	1.97	2.21
Coalition	1.99	2.21	1.95	1.75
Personal	1.98	2.06	1.83	2.08
Pressure	1.87	2.03	1.82	1.65

Note. Means with different letters differ significantly at the $p < 0.5$ level by the Duncan multiple range test.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

RELEVANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Power is undoubtedly humankind's most pervasive social phenomenon. Power is central to the understanding of leadership and social behavior, and the skillful handling of power and influence is critical in today's organizations. The mid-level manager sits in the middle of this social milieu and is expected to use power by exerting influence in lateral, downward, and upward directions to accomplish assigned tasks.

This study adds to the growing body of research in the power tactics arena. This study also extends the investigation from the corporate sector to a community college population. With so little research conducted in the community college setting that addresses power and influence, the possibilities for additional work are considerable. Three major questions for further research emerged from this study.

Do mid-level managers use or report the use of influence tactics less often because some tactics are perceived to be self-serving? The results of this research indicate this possibility because the study did not confirm the expectation that the frequency of influence tactics use among mid-level managers in the community college would be high. The study found that three influence tactics were used moderately often, two tactics were used occasionally, and four tactics were used very seldom. In most cases, influence tactics were directed most frequently in a lateral direction and less often upwardly. Some tactics may be used or reported more often, because they were more easily seen as directed toward organizational advancement. Other tactics may be used or reported fewer times, because they were perceived as private, self-serving strategies.

Several studies in the research literature that addressed the intent of the influence attempt in general or the personal versus organizational dichotomy specifically were referenced. For example, see Schein (1977), Ansari and Kapoor (1978), Kipnis et al. (1980), and Yukl and Falbe (1990). The methodologies used in those works could be adopted to study the relationship of influence tactics (actual or reported) used, and the intent of the influence attempt at various levels of the organization. Since mid-level managers may attempt to keep self-serving influence tactics covert, the research approach would need to go beyond self-reported behavior. Using an influence tactics instrument that measures influence tactics use from the perspective of the target of the influence attempt, rather than the agent, is one possible approach.

Do senior managers in the community college inhibit the use of influence tactics by mid-level managers? Another possible explanation for the infrequent use of influence tactics by mid-level managers in the community college is the inhibiting behavior of upper management. Mid-level managers may infrequently use influence tactics, because they are directly discouraged by upper management, or because the institutional climate developed by upper management inhibits mutual influential relationships in the organization.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One way to approach this research question is to examine the relationship of organizational culture and the prevailing patterns of power and influence. The issue of leadership and organizational culture in the community college was studied by Roueche, Baker, and Rose (1989). A national study would provide normative patterns of power for the community college. A college could examine its power profile compared to national norms for similar institutions. The effect of planned action to change prevailing power profiles could be measured in later studies.

What is the relationship of the frequency of influence tactics use to individual effectiveness? That modern organizations prosper when mid-level managers use frequent, skillful influence attempts is an unstated premise of this study. A study could be designed to explore the relationship between the frequency of tactics use and measures of individual manager effectiveness. The relationship of power use to individual effectiveness has been studied by examining productivity or satisfaction measures in relationship to influence tactics use (Deluga & Perry, 1991; Kipnis & Schmidt, 1988; Thamhain & Gemmill, 1974; Porter, Allen, and Angle, 1981; Schilit & Locke, 1982). The suggested research would span the use of power and the effect of power areas in the power phenomenon model (Yukl, 1989).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING STATEMENT

This research is a first step in the investigation of power and influence in the community college. Mid-level managers, according to this study, did not use influence tactics uniformly. When tactics were used, the frequency significantly varied for all but one tactic, depending on whether they were directed toward co-workers, subordinates, or superiors in the organization. Six of the hypotheses concerning the specific variation by direction were confirmed and three were not supported. The community college population used influence slightly more often than did the corporate population, the rank order of use by influence tactics was almost identical. Personal characteristics of the respondents and college size were not strong correlates of influence tactics use. The findings of this study serve as a starting point for further research, and three major research questions are suggested by the findings. These questions concern the intent of the influence attempt, the role of upper management, and the relationship of influence tactics to individual effectiveness.

To conclude, "Power is a complex topic worth more of continued thinking than of drawing conclusions" (McCall, 1978, p. 4). The research literature concerning power and influence in the community college is just beginning to be developed. More needs to be done.

REFERENCES

Ansari, M., & Kapoor, A. (1978). Organizational context and upward influence tactics. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 40, 39-40.

Deluga, R., & Perry J. T. (1991). The relationship of subordinate upward influencing behaviour, satisfaction and perceived superior effectiveness with leader-member exchanges. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 64, 239-252.

Erez, M. & Rim Y. (1981). The relationship between goals, influence tactics, and personal and organizational variables. Human Relations, 35, 871-878.

Erez, M. & Rim, Y., & Keider, I. (1986). The two sides of the tactics of influence: Agent vs. target. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59, 25-39.

Etzioni, Amital (1975). A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations New York:Free Press

Falbo, T. (1970). The multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 537-547.

Gillett-Karam, R. (1988). Transformational leadership and community college presidents: Are there gender differences? Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.

Grimes, A. J. (1978). Authority, power, influences, and social control: A theoretical synthesis. Academy of Management Review, 3, 724-735.

Izraeli, D. (1975). The middle manager and the tactics of power expansion: A case study. Sloan Management Review, 16, 57-70.

Kanter, R. M. (1981). The middle manager as innovator. Harvard Business Review, 60, 95-105.

Kaplan, R. E. (1984). Trade routes: The manager's network of relationships. Organizational Dynamics, Spring, 37-52.

Kipnis, D. (1976). The powerholders. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Intra-organizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 440-452.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S. M. (1988). Upward-influence styles: relationships with performance evaluations, salary, and stress. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33, 528-542.

Kipnis, D. Schmidt, S. M., Swaffin-Smith, C., & Wilkinson, I. (1984). Patterns of managerial influence: Shotgun managers, tacticians, and bystanders. Organizational Dynamics, 13, 58067.

Kotter, J. P. (1979). Power in management. New York:AMACOM.

Kotter, J. P. (1985). Power and influence: beyond formal authority. New York:Free Press.

McCall, M. Jr., (1978). Power, influence, and authority: The hazards of carrying a sword. Technical Report, 10, Greensboro, N.C.:Center for Creative Leadership.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice Hall

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York:McGraw-Hill.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Power in organizations. Marshfield, MA:Pittman.

Porter, L. W., Allen, R. W., & Angle, H. L. (1981). The politics of upward influence in organizations. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.). Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 3). Greenwich:CT: JAI Press.

Rim, Y., & Erez, M. (1980). A note about tactics used to influence superiors, co-workers, and subordinates. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 319-321.

Roueche, J., Baker, G., & Rose, R. (1989). Shared vision: Transformational leadership and the community college president. Washington, DC: AACJC.

Sayles, L. (1989). Leadership: managing in real organizations. New York:McGraw-Hill.

Schein, V. E. (1977). Individual power and political behavior. Academy of Management Review, 2, 64-72.

Schilit, W. K., & Locke, E. A. (1982). A study of upward influence in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 304-316.

Schmidt, S. M. & Kipnis, D. (1984). Managers' pursuit of individual and organizational goals. Human Relations, 37, 781-794.

Schriesheim, C. A. & Hinkin, T. R. (1990). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis of the Kipnis, Schmidt, and Wilkinson Subscale. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 246-257.

Stevenson, W. B., Pearce, J. L. & Porter, L. W. (1985). The concept of coalition in organization theory and research. Academy of Management Review, 10, 256-268.

Strauss, G. (1962). Tactics of lateral relationships: The purchasing agent. Administrative Science Quarterly, 7, 161-186.

Thamhain, H. J., & Gemmill, G. R. (1974). Influence styles of project managers: Some project performance correlates. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 216-224.

Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in organizations (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. & Falbe, C. (1990). Influence tactics and objectives in upward, downward, and lateral influence attempts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 132-140.